

9

THE AMERICAN PEOPLE
AND
THE ARAB-ISRAELI CONFLICT

by
FRANK HARRIS

Beirut, Lebanon

P.O.Box 236/1638

The writer is an American who has spent a number of years abroad, during which time he has observed the erosion of friendship for and prestige of the United States in several areas of the world. The cause of this erosion, in his view, is due primarily to lack of understanding by a vast majority of the American people of certain established facts.

Information is available in abundance, but the facts are not always sufficiently clear for the otherwise occupied American to add them to his knowledge and retain until such time as they may be important to recall.

*Reprinting or use of all or part of this article is welcomed,
with attribution.*

July 1967

Americans familiar with the Middle East are perplexed over the reaction of their countrymen in the United States to the overwhelming victory of the Israelis over the Arabs in the Six Day War. This reaction, as reflected in the newsmagazines and the one international newspaper published in Europe by Americans, seems to portray exorbitant enthusiasm for the winners and little if any sympathy for the losers. The fact that the enthusiasm appears to approach glee prompts one to enquire whether it is realized that this was a bloody war and not a sports event. During this war, at least 15,000 lives were lost, three times that many were wounded, and the number who have been made homeless exceeds 100,000. Yet Americans appear to be almost dancing in the streets. Is this an expression of relief that the explosion in the Middle East did not result in America becoming involved? Or that nuclear war was not finally triggered by events over which Americans believe they had little or no control? Or is it evidence of a heartless unconcern with the fate of a people who are as deserving of our sympathy as any other sorely distressed peoples in the past?

The Israeli general, Moshe Dayan, visited the scene of the exodus of thousands of Jordanians across the Jordan River on the 2nd of July and during the tour was asked by a British correspondent what Israel planned to do about these and other refugees "to improve the image of Israel." Dayan is reported worldwide as having replied, "I am quite happy about our image." It must be hoped that this was a quick response to a question which may have been phrased in such a manner as to prompt an unguarded reply. It is impossible to presume that Israel will not show some magnanimity in its hour of great victory and somehow alter the policy of refusing to be conciliatory

1093298

about the fate of three-quarters of a million people (by Israel's own count) who lost their lands and homes during the 1948-49 Israeli war and fled or were forced by some circumstance from the area which became Israel. In May 1967, the Palestinian refugee figure had grown to over 1,300,000 receiving assistance from the United Nations Relief and Works Agency, with some 500,000 of these still remaining, after 18 years, in refugee camps maintained and operated by that international agency. These numbers are now swelled by other refugees from the Six Day War of last month. And where is America's sympathy for these?

In all honesty, few Americans who live in the Middle East or know it well are Arabophiles or Israeliphobes. They are nothing more or less than normal Americans who believe, as certainly must all Americans, that "justice for all" should apply universally and at all times. Many of them believe, too, that the following counsel of George Washington in his Farewell Address should not be ignored:

"Excessive partiality for one foreign nation and excessive dislike for another cause those whom they actuate to see danger only on one side ... Real patriots who resist the intrigues of the favorite are liable to become suspect and odious, while its tools and dupes usurp the applause and confidence of the people to surrender their interests."

It seems to these same Americans that very important interests are being seriously jeopardized, if not wholly surrendered, by the lack of any demonstrated sympathy for the vanquished in this latest war, while no alternate interests are being developed in unbounded enthusiasm for the military achievements of the victors.

America's primary material interest in the Arabic speaking

Middle East and North Africa is oil. Its direct investment in oil producing facilities in the area is between 4 and 6 billion dollars. Its investment in what is known as "downstream" facilities, i.e., pipelines and other transport, refineries and distribution facilities to handle the products from Middle Eastern and North African oil fields is estimated to be approximately 50 billion dollars. A large part of this latter investment, it should be remarked, is in Western Europe where the American companies market the major portion of the products derived from the Middle Eastern and North African investments.

America's next most important material interest in the Arab countries is the revenue derived from exports to the area, and these can be said to be largely stimulated by the oil economy which has developed in the last 20 years.

American cultural interests in the Arab countries are of far greater importance than is generally realized. The largest and most influential American educational institution outside of the United States is the American University of Beirut. Established in 1866, this institution represents a large financial investment, the extent of which can be judged from the annual budget of approximately \$14,000,000 and the fact that new construction now nearing completion in the form of hospital additions and a chemistry building are adding approximately \$40,000,000 to the total investment. The return on the investment made during the past century is inestimable. It has graduated a total of some 23,000 students, almost all of them Arabic speaking citizens of the Middle East and North Africa. An interesting footnote to AUB history is that of the countries forming the original United Nations at San Francisco in 1945, AUB graduates were included in the delegations of all the Arab States present. It is no exaggeration to say that, with the possible exception of the great El Azhara University at Cairo, which has been the principal seat of Muslim learning for almost 1,000 years, the American University of

Beirut is the most influential and respected cultural institution in the Arab world. There are other interests, both material and cultural, but the above head the list.

The shock and dismay now prevalent throughout the most intelligent and progressive elements of Middle Eastern society at what they interpret to be universal American support for Israel, and no sympathy whatever for the Arabs, reduce their effectiveness as a sobering influence upon the volatile mass. Without the restraint of such influences, the area might well have burst into wholly destructive flame. In that event, much or all of the American interests could have been lost.

In any case, that dire possibility remains and the American people who are cognizant of these interests must bear the responsibility of the consequences if they fail to initiate steps to arouse public and official concern with the plight of the Arabs, regardless of where the responsibility may lie for that plight.

If America elects to attempt an improvement of its relations with the Arab countries it must first accept the minimal necessity of becoming informed without partiality or prejudice of the factual background of the Arab-Zionist quarrel.

The newsmagazine *Time*, in an otherwise excellent essay on facing the reality of Israel in its issue of June 23, passes over too lightly pertinent facts of history when it wrote, "Almost every text and ritual of the Jewish faith recalls *the land that the Biblical Israelites seized from the Canaanites*." It might well have added that the Canaanites regained their land from the Israelites within several centuries of its being seized. It is important to note also that it is the indigenous descendants of the Canaanites, the Palestinians, who became the principal inciting ingredient leading to the Six Day war.

Time also wrote, "Arabs have lived in Palestine for 1300 years and until recently made up the vast majority of the population." If one reads the record of the meetings of the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee of the General Assembly of the United Nations held November 29 to December 6, 1950, it will be seen that the "bloc" made up of Afghanistan, Egypt, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia and the Yemen, "contended" that the "Arabs had lived in Palestine for thirteen centuries and could not be regarded as a minority." The similarity of the statements may reveal *Time's* source, but in any event the spokesman for the "bloc" caused the Arabs to now be hoisted with their own petard and *Time* has joined him in presenting facts of history in a manner which can be misleading.

The use of the term "Arab" continually adds confusion to an already sufficiently complex ethnological question. *Time* might better have written that the Palestinians have made up the vast majority of the population of the area since the beginning of time. Countless infusions of other peoples have taken place during the 100,000 years that man is known to have inhabited the area. In fact, ethnologists believe that the remains of cavemen of that era indicate that even they represented a mixed race. The hunting, fishing and grain cultivating Natufians of 8,000 years ago were certainly a mixture of races. The next dominant people of Palestine were the Semitic Amorities, who are believed to have originated in Arabia (in which case *Time* would have been closer to the facts had it stated that the Arabs have lived in Palestine for 4,500 years). Two sources in the Old Testament, the E and J documents, differ as to the pre-Hebrew population of Palestine. The first refers to the dominant stock as being Amorities while the second calls them Canaanites. In any event, they were a closely related people, with the former having populated Palestine from about 2,500 B.C. Add to these the Hittites, Hurri, Perizzites, Hivites, Jebusites and one begins to get some idea of the racial

elements that have gone into the evolution of the indigenous people of Palestine.

Into this melting pot came the Hebrews out of the deserts to the East. These wandering tribesmen were probably also made up of polyglot racial elements springing from the area of what are now Kurdistan, Armenia and Azerbaijan provinces in northern Iraq, eastern Turkey, northwestern Iran and extreme southwestern Russia. Mount Ararat, the traditional resting place of Noah's Ark, may be used as a starting point. Over centuries of gradual emigration southward, generally along the course of the Tigris River, through present day Mosul and Baghdad, intermingling with other peoples such as the Arameans, Hurri, Chaldeans and others, the Hebrews emerge at Ur of the Chaldees on the lower Euphrates River, not far from what are now the well-known landmarks of Basra and Kuwait at the head of the Persian Gulf.

Traditionally, Terah, father of Abraham and a descendant of Eber, Shem and Noah, was said to be a member of the Hebrew community at Ur. Abraham migrated westward at the head of several tribes. The Bible invests this migration with the character of a religious movement. They reached Damascus. They were a pastoral people, but the richness of the soil of Palestine invited settlement. The transformation from a pastoral to a settled people was a slow process, particularly in view of the opposition from the Amorites who inhabited the mountainous districts and the Canaanites of the lowlands. Due to this opposition or for other reasons, the Hebrews abandoned their attempt to penetrate Palestine and moved on to Egypt, possibly to join other Hebrew tribes who had migrated there directly from Ur of the Chaldees. Regardless of the reasons, the Hebrews did not then become established in the land of Canaan, even though the first attempt may have continued for a major part of the period between 2000 B.C. (said to be the time of Abraham) and 1500 B.C.

It was not until some centuries later, probably in the spring of 1220 B.C., that Moses led his people out of Egypt and, after almost a generation of wandering around the periphery of the Sinai Peninsula, reached the plains of southwestern Jordan in the vicinity of the present-day tourist attraction of Petra. This was the land of Edom. Parenthetically, one might ask in view of the probability of the Israelis attempting to retain the Sinai Peninsula whether tribal wanderings for a generation in an area such as the Sinai gives descendants of those tribes a justifiable claim to the area over 3,000 years later?

From Edom, Moses led his people northward into Moab in the highlands east of the Dead Sea. Finally, Joshua led them into the land of Canaan by way of Jericho and the second penetration of the Hebrews into Palestine began. The time was about 1100 B.C. Samuel, Saul, David and Solomon led the Hebrews for the next century and a half in almost continual battle against the Palestinians (Philistines) who, even at the height of the United Kingdom about 950 B.C., were never completely subdued and retained control of the coastal plain along the Mediterranean. The United Kingdom of Israel split after Solomon's death, with the northern kingdom then being destroyed by the Assyrians in 722 B.C. and the Diaspora began. Jerusalem fell to the Neo-Babylonians a century and a half later. The downfall of Israel was capped by the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus in 73 A.D. and the fury of Hadrian in 132 A.D.

During all these periods of vicissitude the indigenous Palestinians continued to inhabit the lands and cities. Subdued by many conquerors, they were sufficiently resilient to withstand defeat and were never driven from their homeland, although Hebrew, Persian, Greek, Roman and other blood strains were added to their stock.

This stock, it must be remembered, had already been subjected to

heavy and frequent infusions of Semitic blood of various tribes who moved in from the deep desert wastes to the East to continue their pastoral existence in what are now Jordan and Eastern Israel. These infusions began long before the dawn of history, have continued until quite recent times and have resulted in the ethnological group now known as Palestinians or Palestinian Arabs.

When the Muslim armies swept out of Arabia in the 7th century they made little impact on the ethnological makeup of the peoples along the Mediterranean littoral. Their warriors battered Byzantine and Persian armies in the deserts and open plains of the Middle East. Their primary transport was camels and this factor, along with their training and preference for the terrain of the desert areas, made the mountainous regions guarding the coastal plains obstacles which they were not anxious to challenge unless circumstances made it necessary. Only one important battle took place in what is now Israel. This was against an army of Emperor Heraclius at Ajnadain, inland and slightly north of what is now Gaza. The important battles for control of the area now composed of Israel, Jordan, Lebanon and Syria took place on the plains of the latter. It is interesting to note that a large part of the Byzantine soldiery employed in these battles was made up of what were known as Christian Arabs, tribesmen of Jordan, Syria and northwestern Arabia who had embraced Christianity, in many cases, centuries before.

When Heraclius in Antioch received news of the defeat of his forces in Syria he withdrew north of the Taurus mountains into what is now Turkey, leaving Syria and Palestine with no military defense against the Muslims. Serious inter-church rivalries with Byzantium had not endeared it to the Christians of Palestine and Syria. The warrior class of Semitic bedouin tribesmen soon abandoned their Christian faith and joined the Islam of the Semitic Arab conquerors. Accorded religious toleration, the remaining Christians simply ac-

cepted the hegemony of the Arabs. There was little Arabian migration into Palestine, the Arabs preferring the fringes of the desert to the mountains and seacoast of the area. Thus, there was little change in the ethnological makeup of the Palestinians. Polyglot as was this makeup it was still capable of assimilating the additional slight infusion which did occur and they continued to maintain their own identity. The impact of Islam came from another direction than military subjugation and immigration. Its religion, language and culture soon overran most of the area. Islam replaced much of Christianity, and Arabic superseded Aramaic, which had been the language of Christ and the *lingua franca* of the area for 2000 years.

Through all this transformation, the Palestinians survived and made up the vast majority of the area. For them, there was no Exile until the middle of the twentieth century. No amount of debate can diminish the fact that it was this indigenous people, numbering at least 750,000 — the great majority of the Muslim faith, but with some 100,000 Christians among them — who fled Palestine during the bitter and bloody civil strife between Muslims and Zionists immediately before and after the proclamation of the State of Israel on May 15, 1948.

Debate over responsibility for the flight of Muslim and Christian Palestinians has raged for almost twenty years. Arab spokesmen contend they were forced out by the Israelis, the latter deny the charge as they now insist that Palestinians-become-Jordanians who fled during and after the Six Day War last June did so of their own volition. However, Israel has tacitly admitted on many occasions some obligation in respect to the refugees. Her stand since 1949 has been that the question of the refugees is only one of many which should be discussed in peace negotiations. The stand of the Arab governments has been that they will enter into peace negotiations only after Israel takes steps

to either repatriate the refugees or pay them reasonable compensation for their lands and homes. This impasse has continued since 1949 and is one of history's most deplorable examples of man's inhumanity to man. During this period, the vast majority of the original refugees have passed their lives in squalid, soul-destroying camps while men, not just Arabs and Israelis, argue and debate over what should be done with and for these sorely distressed people whose numbers had passed 1,300,000 prior to June 1, 1967.

Israel at first accepted in principle the responsibility of repatriating certain numbers of the 1948-49 refugees, but as time went on all the properties in Israel belonging to absent Palestinian refugees had been occupied by Jewish emigrants from Europe. This left nothing to which the Palestinians could return in any circumstances, and Israel withdrew the offer to repatriate any large numbers of refugees. Israel then accepted in principle a proposal to compensate the Palestinians for their lost lands, homes, shops and other properties, but understandably, imposed certain conditions. The Arab governments felt some of the Israeli conditions unacceptable as they were announced. No compromise was reached *and no compensation has been paid!*

In the intervening years, the refugees have become almost the sole incitement to war. They are the one rallying point for Arab unity, such as it is. They are an ubiquitous presence throughout the Middle East which constantly reminds the Arabs of their inability to impose, or secure, even a modicum of justice for these hundreds of thousands of Palestinians whose faith in the Arabs and in humanity as a whole has been cruelly unrewarded. Their fate prompts one burning moral question that every Christian and Jew should keep in mind in respect to Israel: why should these indigenous people in another continent lose their lands, their homes, personal property and self-determination because of crimes committed against a European minority by other Europeans?

The resolution of the Palestine refugee problem would certainly enhance and possibly assure chances for an enduring peace between Arab and Israeli, and even the most confident Zionist must be aware that the very survival of Israel depends, in the long view, on that peace being achieved. It is possible that resolution of this problem could be effected in such a manner as to end the inflammatory debate as to whether the Zionists are entitled to lands in Palestine. Defusing this subject of debate would at least smooth the path to peace.

The thought in mind is that Israel, having long accepted the principle of compensating Arab and Christian Palestinians for losses, now agree to settle claims of proven property owners among the refugees and at the same time offer to discuss the possibility of the purchase of all lands occupied since 1947 where it is established that such lands had not previously been bought and paid for by Jewish individuals or organizations.

Land ownership in Palestine as between Arab Palestinians and Jews has also been a subject for heated debate since Israel became a state. Any impartial researcher must inevitably conclude that the most authoritative detailed figures on land ownership in Palestine are those of the Government of Palestine, i.e., the mandatory authority entrusted to Great Britain by the League of Nations and continued until 1948. According to this source, approximately 2 per cent of the total area of Palestine was owned by Jews, who numbered 56,000 out of a total population of 700,000, when British forces entered the area in 1917. The latest Government of Palestine statistics show that at the end of 1945, the figure for Jewish owned land was 5.67 per cent, "Arab" owned land amounted to 47.79 per cent of the total, "other" private owners held 0.54 per cent and the remaining 46 per cent was public domain or land held by the Government of Palestine. It can be seen, therefore, that 94.33 per cent of the land and property

held by Israel prior to June 5, 1967 was acquired by force and without compensation to the rightful owners. What the proportional "Arab" and Jewish rights would be in the 46 per cent Government owned land is debatable, but since the population in 1947 was approximately 1,300,000 "Arabs" and 650,000 Jews, the ratio can be said to be two-thirds to one-third. It can be deduced from the above that Israel has an obligation to recompense private owners and the Palestine refugee community as a whole for approximately 77 per cent of the land comprising Israel. This does not include areas seized since June 5, 1967.

If the Arab-Israeli conflict could be shorn of some of its emotion-arousing historic claim and counter-claim dressing and reduced to the dimensions of the European Jewish community, desperately needing space in which to survive the threat of genocide, having seized lands from unwilling sellers, but now being willing to pay for those lands and become friends with its neighbors, some progress might result. After decades of failure to reduce the causes of conflict between Arabs and Zionists, is the *purchase* formula not worth a try?

Could the Arab governments afford to refuse discussing an opportunity offering vast economic development for Jordan, Syria and Iraq, in particular? The *purchase* formula would inevitably ensure that, except in settlement of private claims, most of the payments involved would go to the financing of development projects in the Arab states such as the latter would decide upon. Any assurance of peace in the Middle East and North Africa will spark enormous additional capital requirements in the oil industries alone. To meet increasing demands for oil, investments of the order of 15 billion dollars are anticipated over the next 25 years for producing facilities. As much as 100 billion dollars may go into "downstream" facilities, such as tankers, pipelines, etc. The Arab states spent some 5 billion dollars

in 1966 for goods and services. Population increase and economic development may cause this annual expenditure to pass the 50 billion dollar mark within a generation. Such trends will generate vast economic development throughout the area — if the necessary capital can be made available. This capital will have to come from the oil owning states, the producing companies, foreign governments and the international banking community. It seems reasonable to presume that these sources would be prepared to channel at least a part of such development capital through a central fund from which loans could be made to Israel enabling it to meet its obligations to the Arabs in respect to land purchases.

Dissenters will predict rejection of the *purchase* formula by Arab leaders. Their first public reaction will probably be opposition. However, there are reasonable chances that they will eventually agree to, at least, discuss the idea. For the first time since Israel became a fact in their lives the Palestinians would face the possibility of being offered tangible and measurable returns for their lost lands and possessions. Their host countries would be assured of concrete financial and technical assistance in fully specified long term economic development projects, enabling them to absorb within their economy, at no cost to themselves and great potential benefit, a specified number of Palestinians. This is on the assumption that, in any case, Israel will not permit more than a part of the refugees to be repatriated. In return, the Arab states would agree to establishment of permanent boundaries in accordance with the purchase agreement and peace with Israel as long as those boundaries are respected.

The Arab attitude toward the Palestine refugee question is too loosely ascribed to intransigence. The problems inherent in permitting, say, a million foreigners to settle in several states, having in each instance economic problems, limited cultivable land, even

more limited water supplies or other natural resources and, in the cases of Egypt, Jordan and Lebanon, already overburdening population difficulties, are not easy to resolve. Americans, more than any other people, should appreciate the problems of immigration or have they forgotten what happened to the proposal made by President Roosevelt in 1942 to rescue 600,000 Jewish refugees from Eastern Europe?

It should be remembered that the Palestinians are not Egyptians, nor are they Jordanians, nor Lebanese, nor Saudi Arabians, nor Syrians. They are Palestinians and, therefore, foreigners in all other states in the Middle East, except in Jordan where they have been admitted to citizenship. Having had uniquely closer contact than their neighbors with the West for centuries through the channel of Christianity and direct tutelage by and exposure to British initiative, culture and respect for law and order from 1917 to 1948, the Palestinians simply are a different people than those of the Arab States, regardless of what political leaders have attempted to imply in recent years. This fact limits the extent of their welcome in neighboring states. They were given haven, but as their stay was prolonged they became, in some instances, a burdening, even embarrassing, factor due to their being competitive to native labor and commercial enterprise. The refugees also became an important political factor, not only in the Arab-Israeli struggle, but in the life of the host states. Political leaders in the host states have been unable to deviate in the slightest from the line that Israel must be obliterated. Arab states with no large numbers of refugees, such as Libya, Tunisia, Saudi Arabia and even Egypt, which has only an indirect problem through the large numbers of refugees in the Gaza strip, have at various times shown an inclination to move toward accepting Israel as a fact with which they must live.

The Six Day War has dampened, to some extent and for the

time being, the importance of the refugees as a political factor. If their importance as a burden on the present and future economies of the host states could now be very much lessened, a principal obstacle to peace in the Middle East would be reduced to manageable proportions and the *purchase* formula appears to hold out that hope.

There is nothing novel about a nation purchasing from other nations lands required for expansion or deemed necessary for the security and interests of the purchasing state. Purchase of land by the United States Government from other governments was common during the territorial growth of the United States. Unfortunately, the practice has gone out of style.

When President Thomas Jefferson heard in 1801 that Spain and France were about to sign a treaty to retrocede the Province of Louisiana to the latter, he concluded that the reinstitution of French sovereignty over the delta and lower course of the Mississippi River would lead to war with that power. Free navigation of the Mississippi, through to the Gulf of Mexico, was essential to the United States and Jefferson set about assuring that it would not be endangered then or in the future. He wrote at the time, "There is on the globe one single spot, the possessor of which is our natural and habitual enemy. It is New Orleans." Jefferson formulated a policy of purchasing the area in the vicinity of New Orleans from Spain, if that power still retained sovereignty over it, or from France, if it had acquired the area from Spain in a secret treaty. The American president had forceful points to make at a time when relations with France threatened war between the two nations and Napoleon decided against a challenge. Instead, he offered to sell the entire Territory of Louisiana and it was accepted by the United States at a price of \$15 million. The purchase added 828,000 square miles and almost doubled the area of the original 13 states.

President John Quincy Adams initiated negotiations with Mexico for the purchase of Texas in 1827. The attempt was unsuccessful, but the Texans later revolted and declared their independence in 1835. They promptly asked to be admitted to the Union. President Van Buren declined the offer, pointing out that Texas was at war with Mexico, while the United States were bound to maintain peace with Mexico by a treaty of amity and commerce, "which will be scrupulously observed." Ten years later Texas was admitted to the Union, despite the fact that Mexico had warned that war would follow annexation. The American government made every effort to resolve the difficulties by diplomacy, but the Mexicans declared war. Undeterred by serious reverses in the field, Mexico chose to prolong the war until it appeared that complete military conquest of the entire nation would be necessary. President James Polk did not wish to carry on a punitive war and sought ways to bring it to an end while at the same time assuring that "our boundary with Mexico should now be established in such a manner as to preclude all future difficulties and disputes between the two republics." He, therefore, instructed his commissioner attached to the American army in Mexico to somehow initiate negotiations on the basis of the United States purchasing from Mexico the disputed territories, most of which were already in American hands, and other territories which might become the subject of future disputes. The effort succeeded and another 750,000 square miles were added to the United States. The purchased area included what are now California, Nevada, Utah, most of Arizona and New Mexico and parts of Colorado and four other states. Mexico also renounced all claims to Texas. The boundary disputes did not end with this purchase and necessitated the Gadsden Purchase in 1853 to finally remove the causes of friction between the two American nations. It is hardly necessary to remark that there are similarities in the American-Mexican conflict and the Arab-Israel dispute.

The next large purchase by the United States was of Alaska from Russia when the latter initiated negotiations to sell. This added over 500,000 square miles to United States territory and *brings the total area purchased in the above mentioned transactions to approximately two-thirds of the present area of the United States.*

One other important accession of territory by the United States came through the purchase of the Philippines, Guam and Porto Rico from Spain following the war of 1898. Again, the United States succeeded in bringing about good relations with a foreign power by offering to purchase territories which it had occupied or seized during a successful war.

Israel may not opt of its own accord to initiate the *purchase* formula, but pressure of Zionist and other opinion in America and Europe supporting the proposal might well bring it to do so. If the American people as a whole, having these precedents of their own history to follow, would take up the idea of purchase by Israel of the lands and properties to which the indigenous people of Palestine have undeniable claims the Zionists in America might well come to accept the principle and undertake to induce the Israeli Government to do likewise. Eighteen years of insistence upon a formula that calls for overall peace talks prior to negotiations about the problems of the Palestine refugees has resulted in deepening hatreds, useless bloodshed and continually increasing misery for most of the refugees. Someone must give if the impasse is to end and the Arabs, in their humiliation, are not apt to do so unless the triumphant Israelis set the tone by making a first conciliatory move. A dramatic gesture in respect to compensation for the refugees and purchase of occupied lands just might start a trend toward peace and stability in the Middle East rather than continued and deepening chaos.

Mistrust and dislike of the United States is intense at the moment

in most of the Arab world, but the sentiments are not yet deeply imbedded. The Suez War of 1956 and the American posture against British-French-Israeli action at the time are recent enough to be remembered by most Arabs and there is a residue of gratefulness to the United States for its stand against aggression. Time is running out, however, and it is essential that America soon demonstrate to the Arabs in some clear manner its continued belief in human rights and the principle of justice for all if it is to halt the growing hatred of Arabs toward the United States of America.

All Americans should note two pertinent remarks in reference to Israel. Chaim Weizmann, first president of the State of Israel, once wrote,

"I am certain that the world will judge the Jewish State by what it will do to the Arabs."

Sir Mark Sykes, a Christian Zionist and trained expert in Middle East affairs, said in 1917, in commenting on the Balfour Declaration,

"Zionism approached in the right spirit will be a cause of great reconciliation (between Arab and Jew) ... Misused it will be the beginning of bitterer strife than ever the world has known."